

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 11, 17 and 21 have been amended. Claims 20 and 23-25 have been cancelled. Claims 1-19, 21 and 22 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Atsushi et al. (JP 10-257084) (hereinafter "Atsushi").

Atsushi discusses a method and device for image pickup of an object with periodic contrast pattern and check method and device using them. Atsushi discusses the problem eliminating an image pickup moiré caused by a relative positional relation between a periodic contrast pattern of an image pickup object and image pickup pixels of a solid-state image pickup device. The solution proposed by Atsushi includes: a solid-state image pickup device 2 of an image pickup system A and a solid-state image pickup device 6 of an image pickup system B image-pickup an image pickup visual field CE of an image pickup object 16 with a periodic contrast pattern via a half mirror 10. An arithmetic processing section 15 calculates a pixel shift quantity in response to the contrast pattern of the image pickup object 16, generates z, y direction moving signals Sz, Sy to shift a position of the image pickup system B in the directions z, y so as to obtain a video signal VB resulting from applying pixel shift to a video signal VA of the image pickup system A. A pixel unit shift correction processing section 13 processes the video signal VB to produce a video signal VB' with a pixel shift quantity equal to or below an image-picked-up pixel size with respect to the video signal VA. The arithmetic processing section 15 applies arithmetic addition processing to gradation value of the video signals VA, VB' for each pixel to obtain a video signal V whose image pickup moiré is eliminated. Atsushi, English Abstract.

Claims 1-10

Amended claim 1 recites: "...an image processor which receives a plurality of images having respective changed lightpaths from the image taking apparatus and generates a processed image with a moiré removed by correcting or superposing the size and brightness of the plurality of the images." Support for this amendment may be found in at least paragraph [0026] of the specification. In contrast to claim 1, Atsushi only discusses arithmetic processing

section 13 which process gradation value of the video signals. However, the image processor of claim 1 processes (corrects or superposing) the size and brightness of the plurality of images.

Claims 2-10 depend on claim 1 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reason.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

Claims 11-16

Amended claim 11 recites: "...generating a processed image in which a moiré is reduced by superposing the size and brightness of the corrected images on one another." Support for this amendment may be found in at least paragraph [0026] of the specification. In contrast to claim 11, Atsushi only discusses arithmetic processing section 13 which process gradation value of the video signals. However, the method of processing an image of claim 11 superposes the size and brightness of the plurality of images.

Claims 12-16 depend on claim 11 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reason.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

Claims 17-22

Amended claim 17 recites: "...taking an additional image from an additional position and superposing the additional image with the first and second images to generated the processed image." Support for this amendment may be found in at least original claim 20. In contrast to claim 17, Atsushi only discusses that the arithmetic processing section 15 applies arithmetic addition processing to gradation value of the video signals VA, VB' for each pixel to obtain a video signal V whose image pickup moiré is eliminated. Claim 17 recites taking an additional image from an additional position, instead of only the two video signals discussed in Atsushi, which are all that is possible considering the half mirror which appears to fixed that is shown in Figure 1 of Atsushi.

Claim 20 has been cancelled. Claims 18, 19, 21 and 22 depend on claim 17 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reason.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

Claim 23-25

Claims 23-25 have been cancelled.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Feb 22, 2007

By: Gregory W. Harper
Gregory W. Harper
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501